



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Koichi YOSHIMURA et al.

Group Art Unit: 2167

Application No.: 10/627,915

Examiner: M. PHAM

Filed: July 28, 2003

Docket No.: 116673

For: SERVICE RETRIEVAL APPARATUS HAVING AUTOMATIC CHANGE
FUNCTION FOR RETRIEVAL CONDITIONS AND METHOD THEREFOR

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the January 30, 2006 Office Action, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Applicants thank Examiners Le and Pham for the courtesies extended to applicants' representative, Mr. Tsou, during the March 9 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

As discussed during the interview, the Office Action must find motivation in the references or in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the applied references or to modify one reference in view of another. See MPEP §2142. Otherwise, the Office Action has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As discussed below, the Office Action has not pointed out a source of motivation to combine Harrisville-Wolff and Hattori. Thus, the Office Action has not born its burden to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.